

REMARKS

Claims 10-18 are pending in the present application. All of these claims stand rejected. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in light of the following remarks.

Claims 10-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chien et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,308,062). The Applicants respectfully traverse for the following reasons.

Concerning independent claim 10, the Office Action asserts, among other things, that *Chien* does not disclose the claimed element of “the mobile component further comprises an identification unit for supplying information to identify the user of the mobile component, at least one the mobile component and the control device evaluating the control commands and converting the control commands into a corresponding control of the consumers connected to the data transmission path and individual functions of the consumers,” but that it is well known in the art of telecommunications. In support of this assertion, the Office Action proffers that “*Chien et al.* strongly teaches the DECT telephone with encryption and decryption components, which further suggest encoding of signals,” corresponding to authorization techniques. This assertion is false for the following reasons.

Contrary to the assertions above, encryption and decryption are not at all equivalent with encoding or authorization techniques. Rather, encryption involves treatment of data to preclude others from reading or deciphering the information. In contrast, encoding is the treatment of data in order to remove redundancy for an original source (i.e., source coding) or to add redundancy such that decoding is possible even though transmission errors may occur (i.e., channel coding). Thus, these are two different concepts that have been expediently characterized as equivalent in the rejection without any substantive facts to back up such assertion. Additionally, authorization is generally a technique of allowing a party to do something and such technique is not necessary for encryption or encoding of signals. Thus, authorization is not an equivalent to encryption and decryption, contrary to the assertions of the Office Action.

The Applicants also point out that the DECT telephone, which is mentioned by *Chien et al.*, was discussed in the specification of the present application. Contrary to the assertion in the present Office Action, however, DECT telephones do not have any means for authentication or authorization. Thus, the assertion of a “strong” teaching, is simply false and one of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize the inaccuracy of this assertion. Moreover, DECT telephones

do not have means for identification (i.e., an identification unit as featured in claim 10). This is due to the fact that a DECT telephone is normally located in a house and, because only "authorized" people are located in the house, authorization would be superfluous.

In light of the above remarks, the Applicant's submit that the reasoning and evidence presented in the rejection of claim 10 are incorrect and that the cited prior art does not teach all of the elements of this claim. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Concerning dependent claims 11-18, these claims are submitted to be allowable on their merits and due to their ultimate dependency on claim 10, which is believed allowable.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance and request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

Patrick B. Law

Reg. No. 41,459

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 781-6801

Dated: September 23, 2004